## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

RONALD L. SMITH : CIVIL ACTION

:

VS.

:

DAVID DIGUGLIELMO, Superintendent;

THE DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF THE :

COUNTY OF PENNSYLVANIA and : NO. 06-2918

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE

STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA :

## ORDER

AND NOW, this 13<sup>th</sup> day of November, 2006, upon review of the Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus filed by Ronald L. Smith and the record in this case, and the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Jacob P. Hart dated October 17, 2006, and Petitioner's Objection to the U.S. Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation, IT IS ORDERED as follows:

- 1. The Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Jacob P. Hart dated October 17, 2006, is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED**;
- 2. Petitioner's Objection to U.S. Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is **OVERRULED**;
  - 3. The Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus filed by Ronald L. Smith is **DISMISSED**;
  - 4. Ronald L. Smith's Motion to Stay is **DENIED**; and,
- 5. A certificate of appealability will not issue on the ground that petitioner has not made a substantial showing of a denial of a constitutional right as required under 28 U.S.C. § 2253 (c)(2).

Case 2:06-cv-02918-JD Document 12 Filed 11/15/06 Page 2 of 2

Petitioner's Objection addresses the timeliness of his Petition for Writ of Habeas Corpus

and grounds for both statutory and equitable tolling. This Court agrees completely with the

analysis of the Magistrate Judge on those issues.

Petitioner filed a Motion to Stay the disposition of his habeas petition on the ground that

he has new evidence to support his claim of governmental interference. The Magistrate Judge

analyzed that claim under Rhines v. Weber, 544 U.S. 269 (2005), and this Court agrees with that

analysis. In short, the Magistrate Judge determined that the "stay and abey" procedure is

appropriate when dismissal of a mixed petition to enable a petitioner to exhaust claims in state

court could jeopardize the petitioner's ability to obtain federal review at a later date. That

procedure is, as the Magistrate Judge explained, inapplicable to this case.

**BY THE COURT:** 

/s/ Honorable Jan E. DuBois

JAN E. DUBOIS, J.

2